



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

nowhere else in the world at any time; having the same basis of common law; people of the same blood; two nations, but one people and one civilization! The Christian people of these two nations must prevent war. It would seem too much like a war of brothers. During a similar strain between these two countries in 1845 Mr. Sumner said:

War with England would be paricidal. The heart recoils and sickens in horror from the deadly shock between children of a common ancestry, speaking the same language, soothed in infancy by the same words of love and tenderness, and hardened into the vigor of manhood under the bracing influence of institutions drawn from the same ancient founts of freedom.

Presbyterians on both sides have already spoken. On Christmas day the Presbytery of Edinburgh sent this message to the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States.

Edinburgh Presbytery, of the Free Church of Scotland, with brotherly greetings, express an earnest hope that everything consistent with the will of Christ will be done on both sides to secure a worthy and peaceful settlement of the question under debate.

To which the moderator of the General Assembly of the United States returned this response:

American Presbyterians respond cordially to the fraternal message of the Edinburgh Presbyterian Free Church, and unite in the hope that the present differences between our nations will be settled on the basis of righteousness and peace.

And this, we believe, is typical of the prevailing sentiment among the Christian classes of both countries.

There are men and women in the homes of both lands, of broad Christian qualities, as noble as ever cherished high honor and a deep sense of justice and equity. They are the salt of both countries. My appeal is to them. They must come to the front and prevent a war which would retard civilization throughout the English-speaking world for at least a hundred years, and would send Christianity on the countermarch for two hundred years.

A JOINT ADVISORY COMMISSION.

BY HON. CARL SCHURZ.

From an address delivered before the New York Chamber of Commerce, Jan. 2, 1896.

It is generally said, in Great Britain as well as here, that there will be no war. The belief is born of the wish. It is so general because almost everybody feels that such a war would be a disaster not only calamitous but also absurd and shameful to both nations. From the bottom of my heart I trust the prediction will prove true. But the prediction itself, with the popular sentiment prompting it, will not be alone sufficient to make it true. Bloody wars have happened in spite of an earnest popular desire for peace on both sides, especially when points of honor inflamed the controversy. It may be in vain to cry "Peace! Peace!" on both sides of the ocean, if we continue to flaunt the red flag in one another's faces.

The commission just appointed by the President indeed consists of eminent, patriotic and wise men. They will, no doubt, conduct their inquiry with conscientious care and fairness. So we think here. But we have to admit that after all it is a one-sided contrivance, and as such lacks an important element of authority. Suppose the report of the commission goes against the British contention. Suppose then we say to Great Britain: "*Our investigation shows this, and we decide accordingly. Take this, or fight!*" How then? It is quite possible that a

vast majority of the British people care very little about the strip of territory in dispute, and would have been satisfied to let the whole of it go to arbitration. It is not impossible even that Lord Salisbury himself, in view of the threatening complications in Europe and other parts of the world, and of the manifold interests involved, might at last rather let it be so submitted than have a long quarrel about it. But it may well be doubted whether any statesman at the head of the British or any other great government would think that he could afford to yield what he otherwise would be disposed to yield, under a threat of war. Similar circumstances would produce similar effects with us. The fact is, therefore, that however peaceable the popular temper may be on both sides of the water, the critical moment will come at the time when the commission reports, and, if that commission remains one-sided as it is now the crisis may become more exciting and dangerous than ever.

But in the meantime there will be something calling for the most earnest attention of the business world on both sides of the Atlantic. While that critical period is impending there will be—who knows how long—a dark cloud of uncertainty hanging over both nations, an uncertainty liable to be fitfully aggravated on occasion, or even without occasion, by speculative manufacturers of rumors. Every business calculation will be like taking a gambler's chance. The spirit of enterprise will be depressed by vague anxiety as to the future, by the apprehension-paralysis, and I need not tell you as experienced business men what all this means as to that confidence which is necessary to set in motion the rich man's money and the poor man's labor, and thus to develop general prosperity. It is of the highest importance, therefore, that this uncertainty be removed, or at least lessened as much and as soon as possible; and the peace sentiment prevailing here as well as in England, of which the friendly message from the Chamber of Commerce in Edinburgh is so cheering an evidence, may perhaps be practically set to work for the accomplishment of that end.

A thought occurred to me when studying President Cleveland's Venezuela message, which, indeed, may well have occurred, at least in general outline, to many others at the same time, because it seems so natural. I am glad to notice that something in the same line was suggested by an English journal. The President has appointed an American commission to inquire into British claims as to the Venezuelan boundary. As I have already pointed out, the findings of that commission will, owing to its one-sided origin, lack an essential element of the moral authority required to command general credit. This authority would be supplied if an equal number of eminent Englishmen, designated by the British government, were joined to the commission to co-operate in the examination of the whole case, and if the two parties, to prevent deadlocks between them, agreed upon some distinguished person outside to preside over and direct their deliberations and to have the casting vote—the commission to be not a court of arbitration, and as such to pronounce a final and binding decision of the whole case, the thing which Lord Salisbury objected to—but an advisory council, to report the results of its inquiry into the whole case, together with its opinions, findings and recommendations to the two governments for their free acceptance or rejection.

It may be said that such an arrangement would not entirely remove the uncertainty as to the final outcome. I believe, however, that it would at least very greatly lessen

that uncertainty. I think it probable that the findings and recommendations of a commission so constituted would have high moral authority and carry very great weight with both governments. They would be likely to furnish, if not a complete and conclusive decision, at least a basis for a friendly agreement. The very appointment of such a joint commission by the two governments would be apt at once to remove the point of honor, the most dangerous element, from the controversy, and thus go very far to relieve the apprehension of disastrous possibilities which usually has so unsettling and depressing an effect.

I do not know of course whether such a plan would be accepted by either government. I think, however, that each of them could assent to it without the slightest derogation to its dignity, and that if either of them received it, upon proper presentation, even with an informal manifestation of favor, the way would easily be open to a mutual understanding concerning it. At any rate, it seems to me worth the while of a public-spirited and patriotic body like this, and of other friends of peace here or abroad, to consider its expediency, and at the close of my remarks I shall move a tentative resolution to that effect, in addition to the one now pending.

I repeat, I am for peace—not, indeed, peace at any price, but peace with honor. Let us understand, however, what the honor of this great American Republic consists in. We are a very powerful people even without an army or navy immediately ready for action; we are, in some respects, the most powerful people on earth. We enjoy peculiar advantages of inestimable value. We are not only richer than any European nation in men, in wealth and in resources yet undeveloped, but we are the only nation that has a free hand, having no dangerous neighbors and no outlying and exposed possessions to take care of. We are, in our continental position, substantially unassailable. A hostile navy may destroy what commercial fleet we have, blockade our ports and even bombard our seaboard towns. This would be painful enough, but it would only be scratching our edges. It would not touch a vital point. No foreign power or possible combination could attack us on land without being overwhelmed on our own soil by immensely superior numbers. We are the best fitted, not, perhaps, for a war of quick decision, but for a long war. Better than any other nation we can, if need be, live on our own fat. We enjoy the advantage of not having spent our resources during long periods of peace on armaments of tremendous cost without immediate use for them, but we would have those resources unimpaired in time of war to be used during the conflict. Substantially unassailable in our continental fastness, and bringing our vast resources into play with the patriotic spirit and the inventive genius and energy of our people, we would, on sea as well as on land, for offensive as well as defensive warfare, be stronger the second year of a war than the first, and stronger the third than the second, and so on. Owing to this superiority of our staying power, a war with the United States would be to any foreign nation practically a war without end. No foreign power or possible combination in the Old World can, therefore, considering in addition to all this the precarious relations of every one of them with other powers and its various exposed interests, have the slightest inclination to get into a war with the United States, and none of them will, unless we force it to do so. They will, on the contrary, carefully avoid such a quarrel as long as they can, and we may be confident that without firing a

gun, and even without having many guns ready for firing, we shall always see our rights respected and our demands, if they are just and proper, may be, after some diplomatic sparring, at last fully complied with.

What is the rule of honor to be observed by a power so strong and so advantageously situated as this republic is. Of course, I do not expect it meekly to pocket real insults if they should be offered to it. But surely it should not, as our boyish jingos wish it to do, swagger about among the nations of the world, with a chip on its shoulder, and shaking its fist in everybody's face. Of course, I should not tamely submit to encroachments upon its rights. But surely it should not, whenever its own notions of right or interest collide with the notions of others, fall into hysterics and act as if it really feared for its own security and its very independence. As a true gentleman, conscious of his strength and his dignity, it should be slow to take offence. In its dealings with other nations it should have scrupulous regard, not only for their rights, but also for their self-respect. With all its latent resources for war, it should be the great peace power of the world. It should never forget what a proud privilege and what an inestimable blessing it is not to need and not to have big armies and navies to support. It should seek to influence mankind, not by heavy artillery, but by good example and wise counsel. It should see its highest glory, not in battles won, but in wars prevented. It should be so invariably just and fair, so trustworthy, so good-tempered, so conciliatory, that other nations would instinctively turn to it as their mutual friend and the natural adjuster of their differences, thus making it the greatest preserver of the world's peace.

This is not a mere idealistic fancy. It is the natural position of this great republic among the nations of the earth. It is its noblest vocation, and it will be a glorious day for the United States when the good sense and the self-respect of the American people see in this their "manifest destiny." It all rests upon peace. Is not this peace with honor? There has of late been much loose speech about "Americanism." Is not this good Americanism? It is surely to-day the Americanism of those who love their country most. And I fervently hope that it will be and ever remain the Americanism of our children and children's children.

THE VENEZUELAN CONTROVERSY.

BY HON. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

From the Boston Herald.

In the Monroe doctrine itself, for reasons which will at once suggest themselves to those acquainted with its history, I naturally take an hereditary interest. But upon that doctrine I do not now propose to touch. My present purpose is to call attention to what seems to be the serious confusion of ideas which exists as to the reason of the position now taken by those who are not in sympathy with President Cleveland in his recent message. In any enunciation of the Monroe doctrine, as of any other doctrine, two separate questions are involved—one a question of matter, the other, of manner. I have read many—not all—of the communications which have recently appeared in the press, both in support of and in opposition to the attitude assumed by President Cleveland. I have talked with many persons who felt a deep interest in the subject. Among those disposed to criticise the